

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13 and 15-16 are independent. Based on the amendments and remarks included herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wright et al.* (USP 6,721,802) in view of *Ward* (USP 6,784,924). Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on March 7, 2007. During the Interview, the parties discussed the outstanding rejections. The Examiner suggested possible amendments that he believed would overcome the outstanding rejections. By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Based upon the discussion during the Interview and the amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, asserting "in which image information limited by a destination service server" is unclear and confusing. By this amendment, Applicant has amended these claims to clarify this claim element. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim elements, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention. Based upon these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103 – *Wright et al./Ward***

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, enabling selection of one of a plurality of menu buttons, wherein each of the plurality of menu buttons correspond to one of a plurality of services including an image storage service, an image print service and a mobile phone screen service ... wherein the selected image is transmitted to the image server to perform the service of the selected one of the plurality of menu buttons.

Applicant respectfully submits, as discussed during the Interview, that *Ward* fails to teach or suggest “enabling selection of one of a plurality of menu buttons, wherein each of the plurality of menu buttons correspond to one of a plurality of services including an image storage service, an image print service and a mobile phone screen service.” Applicant further submits that the menu items of *Ward*, including Figure 2 element 54 and its related discussion, are insufficient to teach or suggest all of the services as recited in the claims including, at least the mobile phone screen service. The purported “services” discussed in *Ward’s* Figure 2, element 54 were merely directed to destinations and/or routes that the camera may communicate with, and do not teach or suggest the services as claimed.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Ward* nor *Wright et al.*, either alone or in combination, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicant does not admit, teach or suggest wherein the selected image is transmitted to the image server to perform the service of the selected one of the plurality of menu buttons.

As neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the references as cited. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 13 and 15-16 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over the references as cited for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Application No. 10/055,379  
Amendment dated March 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 22, 2006

Docket No.: 0879-0372P

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road


Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

  
#52,327